

7. Violich

REVISION of LAND USE PLAN

and PROPOSED NEW
COMPREHENSIVE ZONING PLAN

for SAN FRANCISCO

A report on the theory, principles, and concepts
on which these plans are based, and on the status
of the land use plan.

By WILLIAM E. SPANGLE, JR., City Planner.

With the cooperation of the staff of the
Department of City Planning of the city
of San Francisco.

WILLIAM E. SPANGLE, JR.
CITY PLANNER

September 30, 1949

Mr. Paul Oppermann, Director of Planning
Department of City Planning
100 Larkin Street
San Francisco, California

Dear Mr. Oppermann:

I take pleasure in transmitting herewith a proposed zoning plan for San Francisco, together with a final report thereon.

This zoning plan has been developed with the active participation of the staff of the Department and the advice and assistance of Mr. Ladislav Segoe, City Planning Consultant. Although this zoning plan could not have been developed in its present form without the assistance of Mr. Segoe, I assume full responsibility for the plan, as presented, since Mr. Segoe's services have not been available since the second draft was completed in July.

The final report attached hereto explains the major assumptions made and principles, and concepts followed in developing the zoning plan and the revision of the land use plan.

I have enjoyed working with the Department of City Planning and wish to thank the Commission, Director, and staff for their excellent cooperation throughout the preparation of the zoning plan.

My appreciation is also extended to the other city departments for their valuable suggestions for the revision of the preliminary and second drafts of the zoning regulations.

Special thanks are due to the members of local organizations and in particular to those of the Civic Development and Buildings and Sites Committees of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce for the many hours they have spent in reviewing and discussing the preliminary drafts of the regulations.

Respectfully yours,



William E. Spangle, Jr.

HIT
168
S4
S6
1949
ENV1
C.2

CONTENTS
.....

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

I. THE LAND USE PLAN

II. REVISION OF LAND USE PLAN

III. PURPOSE OF ZONING PLAN

IV. PROPOSED ZONING PLAN

Classes of Districts
Density and Open Space Standards
Conditional Uses
Transitional Uses
Building Height Regulations
Floor Area Ratios
Planned Unit Development
Off-street Parking
Off-street Loading
Zoning Plan - Land Use Plan - Contrasts

V. QUANTITATIVE COMPARISONS

Zoning, Land Use and Population

I. THE LAND USE PLAN

.....

WHAT IS THE LAND USE PLAN?

The land use plan is a design for the way the city is to be encouraged to grow and develop in order to provide optimum living and working conditions for its inhabitants within the space needed for its present and emerging functions. It represents San Francisco's vision of the city of tomorrow, based on practical knowledge of what exists today and what can be reasonably attained in the foreseeable future.

UNIQUE LOCAL SITUATION

San Francisco is faced simultaneously with exceptional problems and with great opportunities for development rarely found in other cities. Water bounds the city area on three sides and mountains limit development on the fourth; the existing 44 square miles of land area mark the limit for future physical expansion; rugged topography rising from sea level to many peaks up to 900 feet in elevation offers opportunities for original types of development. For these reasons those who have been concerned with planning for the future of the city since its destruction by fire in 1906 have pointed out the importance of efficient use of land in the interests of sound development, prosperity and well-being for its citizens.

On the one hand we have outstanding examples of good use of land such as the West of Twin Peaks area and elsewhere where advance planning has resulted in orderly development and stable property value. On the other hand conditions that now prevail in the Western Addition and the blighted areas south of Market Street make it clearly evident that haphazard development does not produce the kind of environment worthy of San Francisco's magnificent site.

1921 ZONING ORDINANCE

As early as 1921 the people of San Francisco were concerned with the need for providing a guide for the future use of land in the City. This concern, and the more immediate need for protection of densely built residential and commercial areas against noxious and offensive uses, led to the adoption of one of the first zoning ordinances in the United States. Although this ordinance has been of great benefit to many sections of the city, it has not served as a real guide for the development of the city since it was not based on a realistic concept of what the extent and relation of the various uses of land should and could be. The idea of rational functional organization of land use in cities has, in large measure, developed since the time of the adoption of this early zoning ordinance. Most of the scientific knowledge of land use and city planning has evolved since that time.

BUDGETING THE LAND

The first comprehensive report on use of land in San Francisco was made for the City Planning Commission by Mr. Bryant Hall in 1944. This report "Budgeting the Land" contained an analysis of existing land use in San Francisco and explored possibilities for use of the land in

the city. Factual information for this report was derived largely from the city-wide survey of existing land uses made by the Works Progress Administration under the sponsorship of the City Planning Commission in 1937. An important conclusion of the report was stated as follows:

"The next step, with the information now available and being assembled, will be the preparation of a land use plan. This will serve as a guide to the readjustment of the zoning plan, to the modernization of the zoning ordinance itself, . . . and to the selection of areas for redevelopment. With other parts of the master plan it can lead toward the creation of a city of which all citizens may be proud. . . . It will be a better city if we can make wise use of our exceptional but limited land resources."

1945 ADOPTED LAND USE PLAN

A land use plan was prepared and adopted as a part of the master plan in 1945. This plan was limited to proposals for the general extent and distribution of land uses, public and private, by study areas based on census tracts, and did not attempt to define the location and inter-relation of the various types of private land uses and public facilities to be provided within these areas. The first official declaration of policy regarding standards for residential density and open space is set forth in this plan.

The section of the adopted land use plan dealing with public land uses is restricted, in the main, to showing locations of existing facilities and the new facilities that had been proposed by the various operating departments and agencies. No differentiation is made between existing facilities that are properly located and will continue to serve a valuable function and those that are not. The statements, in the plan, of proposed standards for size, location, and service areas for the various public facilities are incomplete in many respects.

The greatest deficiency of the adopted land use plan is that it expresses no real concept of how the several functional portions of the city and the various land uses within each of these portions should best be organized in order to make the city an efficiently functioning organism and a pleasant place in which to live. Those who prepared the plan were fully aware that the plan was not complete and would require extension and revision based on further study, new information, and new and more complete standards for public and private facilities.

II. REVISION OF THE LAND USE PLAN

.....

In 1947 it was recognized that the revision and refinement of the land use plan must proceed with the utmost dispatch. The program of the City Planning Commission called for a new zoning plan to replace the archaic zoning ordinance of 1921 and an integrated transportation plan to provide solutions for the city's many transit and traffic problems. It was evident that neither intelligent planning for transportation nor the development of a sound zoning plan could proceed without well conceived land use plan that established a guide for the function

organization of land uses in the city. The revision of the land use plan now in process will give the city a plan that will provide this guide.

Basic Factors. The fundamental principle being followed in developing the revised land use plan is that all the land should be utilized to its highest potential. This does not mean that each individual piece of property should be crowded with development, but rather that land should be used for those purposes that will make the greatest contribution to the welfare of the city and at the same time, if in private ownership, will yield a fair return on an investment.

Basic factors that must be considered in allocating land uses in San Francisco are:

1. Relation of San Francisco to the region and the special functions the city performs because of this relation.
2. The physical character of the land.
3. Existing development - type and quality.
4. Existing and proposed transportation facilities.
5. Climate.

In revising the land use plan it has been assumed that the major functions of San Francisco are:

1. To provide appropriate space for industry and commerce.
2. To provide places for dwellings.
3. To provide services necessary in order for people to live and work satisfactorily in the city.
4. To provide services to the metropolitan area that can best be provided by the central city.
5. To provide port facilities for a large portion of the west coast.

GENERALIZED LAND USE PLAN

The land use plan now being developed is based on the concept that areas for the major production-service activities should be separated from the areas where people have their homes. These two major functional divisions of the city, although dependent on each other, contain activities that are by their nature incompatible if mixed indiscriminately. It is fortunate that San Francisco, because of the form of its topography, has tended to develop in such a manner that these two parts of the city are clearly defined and in many cases separated by steep hillsides. With these two major functional areas defined it is then necessary to develop the best possible organization of land uses within them.

In the production-service area major land uses that must be accommodated are the port and related uses, industry, both light and heavy,

warehouses, transportation terminals, the metropolitan shopping center, the financial district, and certain amusement, cultural and recreational activities. Proper location and organization of these uses within the production-service area is necessary and is being considered in detail in the development of the land use plan.

In the residential section of the city the concept in developing the land use plan is that this portion of the city will best fulfill its function if developed as a number of individual community areas within the city, with each community being further divided into neighborhoods. This kind of organization has tended to develop in San Francisco because of topography and large public areas like Golden Gate Park. It is the purpose of the plan to reinforce this tendency. A tentative community and neighborhood plan was developed and presented to the Planning Commission in February 1948. This plan has served as a guide for the development of the generalized land use plan for the entire city and provided a general frame for the transportation studies. More detailed land use plans for each community area and each segment in the production-service area are now in process.

The generalized land use plan as now developed shows the division between the production-service area and the residential area and indicates the general organization within these parts of the city. The production-service area is divided into areas for heavy industry, light industry, and commerce, with a buffer area for wholesale business and very light industry situated between the commercial section and the industrial section.

Twelve community areas, each of which is further divided into neighborhood units, are shown in the residential portion of the city. A general pattern of residential densities is indicated. Within each community area the plan provides locations for the major facilities, both public and private, that are necessary for the convenience and well-being of the residents of the community, including a community shopping center, high schools and the larger recreation areas.

The more detailed land use plans now being developed for each community area indicate all the proposed public and private uses of land that are necessary for community and neighborhood use. These plans provide for at least one major shopping center in each community with other major commercial areas to provide space for the many "service" type businesses such as repair shops of various kinds, small laundries, and dry cleaning establishments that are needed to serve the residents of the community. In addition, several small neighborhood shopping centers are proposed in each community to provide space for stores such as grocery stores, meat markets, drug stores, and personal service shops, that serve the daily needs of the people of the immediate vicinity.

Community Centers. The ideal community would have one large community shopping center with a community center for the public facilities that serve the entire community located in close proximity. This will not be easy to achieve in San Francisco because in many cases these public facilities are scattered throughout the community areas. The Sunset Community Center is an example of how this type of center can be developed in new areas. This kind of center will also be possible in our large redevelopment areas.

Neighborhood Units. The neighborhood unit is proposed as the primary planning unit for the city. Those indicated on the community area land use plans are large enough to accommodate a population of between 2,500 and 14,000 persons, depending on the age and family size composition and population density in each neighborhood. Each neighborhood is bounded by major or secondary thoroughfares and, insofar as possible, is designed so as to have no through traffic traversing the neighborhood.

Within each neighborhood it is proposed that there be located the public facilities and private services that are necessary to meet the daily needs of the inhabitants. These include an elementary school, a playground, churches, and neighborhood shopping centers to bring stores within easy reach of all inhabitants. In many parts of San Francisco, because of steep hills and other natural barriers, these shopping centers must be placed much closer together than is generally considered necessary or desirable.

Other facilities needed within the neighborhood are doctors' and dentists' offices, health clinics, branch libraries, post offices, fire and police stations, and branch telephone exchanges, and other similar utility installations. The normal service areas for many of these facilities are larger than the neighborhood so that they will not be located in each neighborhood.

The land use plan thus proposes an organization of the city with two major functional portions -- the residential area and the production-service area -- with a rational relationship between these areas that will provide a combination of economic opportunity and pleasant living.

III. PURPOSE OF ZONING PLAN

.....

Zoning is a legal tool for guiding the development of the city towards the accomplishment of some of the major objectives of the land use plan. Regulations, based on the police power, define districts within which various uses may be located and specify conditions that are necessary in regard to certain uses, to assure the kind of development that will be an asset to the city. Zoning has been frequently thought of simply as regulations that restricted the use of property. In developing the zoning plan for San Francisco a positive approach has been followed, keeping in mind at all times the objectives of the master plan in regard to the organization of land uses in the city and the expressed and evolving standards that will determine the quality of the San Francisco of tomorrow.

IV. PROPOSED ZONING PLAN

.....

WHY FOURTEEN CLASSES OF DISTRICTS?

The fourteen classes of zoning districts were developed after careful consideration of the existing pattern of land use in San Francisco and the functional organization of the city envisaged by the evolving

land use plan. The classes of zoning districts proposed are designed to reflect the desirable functional organization of the city, and thereby provide space for all the diverse uses that are necessary in a great urban center in a manner that will result in the greatest advantage for the city and its inhabitants. The uses assigned to each class of district were determined after examination of the locations of the various uses in the city, the way these uses tend to be associated, and the apparent effects of certain uses on the areas in which they were located. In drafting the regulations for each class of district, the objective was to group those uses that were compatible and exclude those that were not. Where uses are necessary and desirable in a district, but of a nature that makes them potentially detrimental, conditions are specified that will mitigate the detrimental effect of these uses on adjoining properties.

PROPOSED DISTRICTS IN THE PRODUCTION-SERVICE AREA.

Five classes of districts, C-4, C-5, C-M, M-1 and M-2, are proposed for application to the production-service area described under the land use plan. The C-4 district is to apply to the core of the central business district and the regulations are designed to protect the city's high value shopping center and financial district. San Francisco has an exceptionally well developed central shopping district that serves not only the city but also the specialty shopping needs of the entire metropolitan area. As new decentralized shopping centers continue to develop in other parts of the bay area, it becomes increasingly important to maintain the quality and improve the efficiency and convenience of the central area so that it can survive in competition with the new centers.

C-5 Districts. The C-5 central business and service district, is intended for application to the area surrounding the core of the central business district. The regulations for this district are less restrictive than those for the C-4 district and will permit greater diversity of use. There are many uses that need to be located in proximity to the center but that are not compatible with high value retail stores or the intense use of land in the financial district. Many of these uses are services required for the central area, such as parking lots and garages, automobile rental agencies, wholesale stores, certain types of light manufacturing, and building maintenance and repair services. In addition to providing space for these essential services, the C-5 district will allow (appropriate space) for the expansion of the C-4 district. Some parts of the C-5 district, as designated, are now in transition, tending to become more retail in character.

C-M Districts. The C-M district will provide space for wholesale businesses, auto repair garages, light manufacturing uses, and warehouses for commodities which are not by nature hazardous, noxious, or offensive in an area of intensive use. It will be a buffer area between the central business district and the outright industrial districts. Limitations and controls recommended for uses in this district are designed to protect not only the adjoining high value business district, but also other properties within the C-M districts.

M-1 Districts. Industries which require relatively small floor or ground area per worker and add a high value to product in relation to space occupied are the kind that are tending to locate in San Francisco. These industries can afford to pay the relatively high land costs existing here,

in order to be near their labor supply and markets. The regulations drawn for the M-1 districts are intended to protect existing industries of this type and encourage other similar industries to locate in the city.

M-2 Districts - Heavy Industry. In developing the use regulation for this district uses have been listed in three classes in relation to their "nuisance" characteristics. All the uses listed as permitted only in the M-2 districts are uses that produce dust, smoke, odor, noise or fumes or that handle products or involve processes that tend to be more than normally hazardous and would therefore tend to be objectionable to any adjoining use that required clean, quiet, pleasant surroundings, free from excessive hazard. Distance regulations have been devised to apply to each of these three groups in order to place those involving the greatest potential nuisance or hazard at the greatest distance from adjoining more restricted use districts, particularly residential districts. The uses listed in the third category, subdivision 4 under principal uses permitted in the M-2 districts, in addition to complying with the stringent distance regulations, would require authorization by the Planning Commission as "Conditional Uses". Examination of the type of uses listed in this category will indicate the reason for this. These are uses that should not be located in San Francisco unless their conditions of operation, type of buildings and situations are such as to prevent damaging adjacent property and creating hazards to the health and safety of persons working or residing in the neighborhood. Land in this city is too valuable to permit the owner of one parcel to blight and prevent development of the land of adjoining owners by locating such an industry in the wrong place or without proper safeguards. The area adjacent to Hunters Point is an example of blight and arrested development resulting in great degree from improper location and control of such industries.

RESIDENTIAL AREA

Nine classes of zoning districts are required in the residential portion of the city in order to effectuate the organization within this portion of the city required by the land use plan. Six residential and three commercial districts are proposed. The three commercial districts are needed in order to provide the kind of shopping and service facilities necessary in the residential communities.

C-1 - Neighborhood Shopping Centers. This classification will permit all types of business necessary for the daily shopping needs of those living in the immediate vicinity - grocery stores, meat markets, drug stores, soda fountains, service stations, and the like. Business and professional offices would also be permitted. The regulations are designed to provide the maximum protection to adjoining residential areas as well as affording protection to the quality of development within the shopping center.

C-2 - Community Shopping Centers. This class of district will apply to the center or 100 per cent section of our major community shopping districts. In almost every community area designated by the land use plan a major shopping center has already developed. The regulations for C-2 districts will protect the character of these existing centers by excluding the kinds of uses that are detrimental to high value retail business and thus, increase the stability of these districts.

C-3 - Community Business and Service Districts. There are many uses other than retail stores that must be located in the residential portion of the city. Laundries, cleaning establishments, carpenter, plumbing and furniture repair shops are all services essential to the residential community. These activities, although necessary, are not good neighbors for retail business, unless associated with a retail outlet since they tend to interrupt the "shopping" character of the district. These businesses should therefore be located away from the center of the shopping district with appropriate regulations regarding their size and character of operation to protect adjoining residential areas and other businesses within the C-3 district.

PEOPLE MAKE THE CITY

The population of San Francisco includes many different kinds of people. People of various age groups, family characteristics, occupations and income levels. All with different social, economic and cultural aspirations and requirements. Many types of dwellings are needed to fulfill the needs of such a varied population.

R-4 and R-5 Districts. As the central city of the metropolitan area, San Francisco has a higher than usual portion of a single person and two person households who have located here in order to be near the core of the metropolitan area. The centrally located residential areas are therefore in high demand for apartment buildings. The "open space" requirements of these people are not as great as for families with children. Higher population densities are therefore possible. The R-4 and R-5, medium and high density multiple dwelling districts, are to apply to the close-in portions of the residential area. The R-5, high density multiple dwelling district, is to apply to the hilltop areas that are in special demand because of convenience and view and also to certain property adjoining wide thoroughfares, such as Van Ness Avenue, that provide additional open space and convenience to transportation.

R-4 Districts. The R-4, medium density multiple dwelling district will apply to other close-in residential areas that are not quite as advantageously situated as the R-5 areas. In general, these are the slopes of the hills, providing view and convenience but to a lesser degree than the hilltops themselves. This location of the R-4 and R-5 areas follows the existing tendency in regard to apartment building location and also generally reflects existing differences in land values.

R-3 - Low Density Multiple Dwelling Districts. This classification will apply to the less advantageously situated residential property in the central areas and will be used to provide space for multiple dwellings in the outlying areas. In general these districts will provide space for dwellings for families who, because of children or for other reasons, require more open space than is possible in the higher density districts.

R-2 Two family Dwelling Districts. This classification will provide space for two family flats and protect areas such as Potrero Hill and those parts of the Richmond, Sunset and Miasa on where this type of dwelling is either prevalent or interspersed with single family dwellings.

There are large areas of San Francisco where these conditions prevail and the established character of such areas should be protected from indiscriminate intrusion of higher density dwellings.

R-1 Single Family Row House Districts. This classification was developed to apply to the extensive areas in the city where the single family row house is the dominant type.

R-1-D Single Family Detached Dwelling Districts. At present the areas of fine detached homes do not have the kind of protection thru zoning that they need. This class of district is included in the zoning plan to preserve the character of these districts and prevent the re-subdivision of lots and the intrusion of row type dwellings. In addition to its application to areas presently occupied by detached dwellings, it will be applied to all large undeveloped sections of the city and to the large public areas such as the Presidio, Golden Gate Park, Lake Merced, and Fort Funston. This will enable the city to retain control of these large areas in case of future development, the character of which it is not possible to ascertain at this time. In cases of future development or change from public to private ownership, appropriate zoning classifications should be established based on the land use plan and such new information as may be available at the time the development or change is contemplated.

DENSITY AND OPEN SPACE STANDARDS

All those who have studied the blighted and slum areas of San Francisco have agreed that inappropriately high population densities coupled with lack of yards, courts, and open spaces of sufficient size for light, air and private use are major causes of blight and decay.

The need for regulation governing density, building height, building coverage, yards and courts has been recognized since the earliest days of zoning as being just as important as use regulations. It has been evident that such regulations were required in order for the community and property owners collectively to obtain the full benefits of zoning.

Mr. Ladislav Segoe, Consulting City Planner, in a statement to the Planning Commission on April 7, 1949 said in part:

"Keeping the intensity of developments within limits appropriate in each class of district, by means of height, lot coverage, density and other regulations has three major aspects. Such regulations condition, if not determine, to a large degree:

(1) The quality of living conditions as influenced by building volume relative to site area and the density of population.

(2) The load on streets, utilities, schools, recreation areas, and other community facilities.

(3) The stability and desirability of building developments over a sustained period, and thereby the realizable aggregate income from investments in buildings and the tax income of the city as well.

"For these and other reasons, regulations of the intensity of use and not of use alone have been recognized from the start of zoning, as essential to make zoning effective. Obviously, the over-intensive use of his property by one owner can be just as damaging to his neighbors as an incompatible type of use. For such over-intensive use is usually possible by borrowing light, air and outlook from neighboring properties, and deprives the owners of these properties of the opportunity to make even reasonably effective use of the potentialities of their holdings. The builder of an excessively tall apartment house or office building with excessive coverage and without large enough yards or courts on its own site to provide adequate light and air for every room is dependent for these on his neighbors and gambles that these neighbors are not going to use their property in similar manner - a reasonably safe gamble. He would likely be ruined by similarly designed buildings on adjoining lots, if any of his neighbors were foolish enough to build such a structure. The blighting effect of such structures reaches farther than their shadows, it has been said.

Protection for Individual Owners. Furthermore, the effective demand for apartments, or for office space for that matter, is, under such practices, absorbed by relatively few properties, depriving owners of other equally suitable properties of the opportunity to get their share in meeting such demands. The community, too, suffers, for property values in the aggregate are apt to be lower under such building practices, and the over-concentration of people and traffic places extra burdens on the city in providing additional and sometime special public facilities and services.

Overbuilding Causes Blight. With very little buildable open land left, the tendency toward over-intensive building is likely to increase as time goes on. In any event, restraint by the individual owner with respect to the intensity of use can no more be relied upon than with respect to the type of use, to protect the property owners of the community against selfish or imprudent practices by neighbors and to promote desirable community development.

Proposed Regulations To Control Intensity of Use. Therefore, as has been done long ago in other cities, the tentative draft of the new comprehensive zoning ordinance includes provisions limiting the intensity of uses in all classes of districts by means of various density, height, bulk, yard and other open space regulations appropriate for each. Off-street parking space and loading space requirements have also been included in zoning ordinances in recent years to cope with the ever increasing traffic and parking problem, and the tentative draft of the new zoning ordinance likewise contains proposed regulations of this kind.

San Francisco's Unique Situation Recognized. In applying widely accepted up-to-date zoning principles and practices to the revision of the present zoning ordinance, the unusual conditions that obtain in San Francisco have been given full recognition - such as limited area of the city, scarcity of undeveloped land, relatively high land costs, favorable climate, hilly topography, the openness and outlook of hilltop sites, and unique local building types. In consideration of these and other factors, the proposed regulations in the tentative draft pertaining to the intensity of use are much more liberal than would be regarded sound from the community planning standpoint in other cities - even those much larger than San Francisco. Actually, if these regulations were judged without reference to local conditions they would be considered far too liberal".

CONDITIONAL USES

There are a large number of private land uses, which although necessary and desirable in many different zoning districts, are of such nature that in many circumstances they could be harmful to persons or property in the vicinity. Many of these are comparable to the public uses such as schools, playgrounds, health centers, public transit facilities or publicly owned utility installations. Proper locations for these public facilities can be determined through advance planning and conditions established, that will protect private property in the neighborhood and insure harmonious relation to other public buildings and uses. Most of those public uses are, or will be, included in the land use plan.

The location of comparable private uses such as hospitals, private non-profit recreation areas, parochial schools, churches, and private utility installations are of almost equal public importance. Many of these facilities like nursery schools, parochial schools and churches are necessary to serve residential areas. Others, like hospitals, rest homes and similar institutions have the same need for clean, quiet, spacious surroundings as private homes. Still another group, including certain utility installations and communications facilities, must be located in particular spots because of operating requirements.

The above mentioned types of uses are classified as "Conditional Uses" in the proposed zoning plan and require authorization by the Planning Commission before they can be located in any district in which they may be permitted.

The Planning Commission will be able to make decisions regarding authorization of these uses guided by general planning principles and taking into consideration the effects of any such proposed use on the surrounding neighborhood. Section 129 of the Proposed Zoning Plan establishes procedure to be followed and certain principles to be adhered to in reaching decisions regarding authorization of any "Conditional Use". The procedure includes manner of application, notice to adjoining property owners, report from Zoning Administrator, and public hearing.

The conditional use provisions will eliminate the need for spot zoning required under the present zoning ordinance in order to meet the locational needs of this class of uses and will provide the measure of control necessary in order to protect the general welfare of the community.

TRANSITIONAL USES

The transitional use provisions are introduced to mitigate the effect of more intensive commercial and industrial districts on property immediately adjoining such districts and located in a residential district. Values of property in this fringe area have frequently been depressed since the location, very often, was not desirable for uses normally permitted in the residential district.

In each residential district, therefore, the proposed zoning plan specifies certain additional uses that are permitted on residential property that abuts or faces an industrial district. In general, more intensive types of dwellings are permitted to occupy such lots. For example, in the R-1 district a two family dwelling may be erected as a transitional use.

Other types of uses permitted as transitional uses are churches, doctors' offices, private non-profit schools, non-profit clubs, and other similar uses listed in the use regulations for the several R districts.

BUILDING HEIGHT

The main purposes of the building height regulations in the residential districts are:

1. To insure that adjoining properties will not be unduly shaded by taller buildings.
2. To protect the character of existing and future development and thereby help maintain the stability of such development.
3. To prevent, insofar as possible, undue interference with outlook from adjoining properties. View has always been a very important consideration in San Francisco and in many parts of the city is a major factor in establishing property values. Since one of the major purposes of zoning is to promote and protect the economic stability of private lands in the city it is, therefore, proper that zoning regulations should protect view.

Precedent for regulation of building height to protect view has been long established in San Francisco. Because of the extremely complex topography it will not be possible to give adequate protection to all areas through the normal practice of establishing building height solely in relation to zoning districts. Therefore, in addition to the regulation of building height by zoning districts, a separate section has been established in the zoning regulations to permit special height limits to be established where necessary. An example of this will be a height limit around the north and east side of Telegraph Hill conforming essentially with that now established by the Building Code. It is proposed that those special height limits now in the Building Code that were established to protect view and that have no relation to structural requirements be transferred from the Building Code to the Planning Code and become part of the comprehensive plan for height of buildings.

Floor Area Ratios:

In the second draft of the proposed zoning plan, height limits were proposed for the C-4, C-5, C-M, M-1, and M-2 districts. The major purpose for regulating building height in these districts was to control intensity of use, particularly because of the effect of over intensive use on traffic and transit facilities. In developing the third draft of the proposed zoning plan it was felt that the height regulations for these districts proposed in the second draft were too complex and imposed undue restrictions on building form. The regulations, as proposed in the second draft, had the advantage of insuring light and air to adjoining property and preventing undue shading of public streets. These considerations, in relation to local conditions, did not seem sufficient to warrant such rigid controls on the disposition of building bulk on the individual lot at this time, although this type of regulation may become necessary or desirable in the future. If so, control of building height in relation to streets and adjoining properties can be added to the zoning regulations.

A simple means of controlling intensity of use is proposed in the September 30 draft of the zoning regulations. It is proposed that intensity of use be controlled by establishing a maximum permitted floor area ratio for each class of district. Floor area ratio is quite simply defined as ratio of the floor area of the building to the area of the lot on which the building is situated. Floor area of the building, in this case, means gross floor area, exclusive of cellar and basement areas used only for storage or services incidental to the operation of the building. The floor area ratios recommended as maximums to be permitted, were determined after consideration of existing development, present traffic volumes in relation to existing development, and property values. It is believed that the ratios proposed will permit economic development of property without creating undue congestion.

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT

This provision will permit large scale unified development to be designed to make the best use of the site. It will permit the planned organization of large or reasonably large sites in which may be combined different types of dwellings, in a manner not possible when development is confined to individual lots. The regulations specify procedures to be followed and standards to be adhered to for such developments. The experience of the past two years in San Francisco with developments like Stonestown, Kirkham Heights, Park Merced, the Stadler Property in Sutro Forest, and the project of the Twin Peaks Development Company highlight the need for zoning regulations designed to permit and assist large scale development. The above mentioned developments conform in all major respects to the proposals of the new zoning plan.

OFF-STREET PARKING

Requiring the provision of off-streetside parking in conjunction with new construction and expansion of existing uses in areas outside the C-4 districts will not solve, of itself, the parking problem in San Francisco. It will however, tend to keep the present situation from becoming more acute and over a period of time will provide many additional parking spaces in the city.

This portion of the zoning plan is intended to be one part of the following three-pronged attack on the parking problem:

1. Regulations and enforcement that will lead to the most effective use of available curb space.
2. Designation of areas, after study by the Department of City Planning, in consultation with other city departments and agencies concerned, where there is a need for the establishment of off-street parking facilities to be provided by joint public-private action.
3. Requirements under zoning regulations for the provision of off-street parking facilities in conjunction with new construction and expansion of existing uses.

The proposed requirements for off-street parking include several exceptions that will facilitate the application of these requirements to San Francisco. Collective provision of off-street parking facilities for

two or more buildings or uses is permitted. This will allow owners of several buildings jointly to provide their required off-street parking on one lot. Off-street parking for most uses is not required to be on the same lot with the building but may be located several hundred feet away, the distance depending on the type of use.

Joint use of facilities is also permitted in order to permit use of facilities during certain hours that were provided for a use normally requiring such facilities at other times. For example, parking space provided for a retail store could be used to fulfill the parking requirements of a church. Or, parking facilities provided to serve an office building could be used to fulfill, partially, the off-street parking requirements for a theater.

One of the most important exceptions, however, is that which becomes operative when parking facilities are provided by public action for a district. In such case, all existing buildings and uses, and all new buildings within the district are to be exempt from the requirements of the zoning plan regarding off-street parking. However, in such districts in certain specific cases where a new building or an addition to or change of use of an existing building creates a need for an exceptional amount of parking space, the Board of Supervisors may, upon recommendation by the Planning Commission, require provision of off-street parking space in conjunction with the individual building.

Under the proposed zoning plan it will be possible to provide off-street parking space for commercial or industrial uses as "Conditional Uses" in residential districts. Conditions are specified in the regulations regarding fencing, screening, development, and operation of such facility. Authorization by the Planning Commission would be required.

It is recommended that the provisions of Section 11OK be declared inoperative in relation to commercial and industrial buildings until a parking authority is functioning and areas have been designated for the provision of off-street parking by districts.

OFF-STREET LOADING

The practice is well established under zoning through^{out} the country that places of business and industries involving receipt or delivery of goods by truck provide off-street loading space. San Francisco has particularly acute problems with parked trucks blocking its narrow streets and alleys. Requiring the provision of off-street loading in connection with new building will mean, in the long run, that our streets will become much more efficient carriers of traffic. It will also mean important savings to owners and operators of trucks resulting from increased efficiency in the use of labor and equipment as proper loading facilities are made available. This will result in a gain to the entire community and in addition make the city a pleasanter and more convenient place in which to transact business.

Certain objections have been raised regarding the application of the off-street loading provisions to properties with narrow street frontages and no secondary means of access. It is possible that

additional exceptions should be made in such cases. This should be the subject of additional detailed study.

ZONING PLAN - LAND USE PLAN - CONTRASTS

Industrial Clearance Areas. The zoning district maps will be found to vary from the Land Use Plan in a number of areas for the reason that uncontrolled change in use would, in these areas, either be damaging to existing values or make sound redevelopment impossible. For example, where the Land Use Plan shows future industrial uses including islands of old residential blocks such as in the South of Market area and adjacent to Third and 20th Streets, the zoning district maps indicate a residential district. In this way the area may be reserved for future industrial clearance on a large scale providing for both relocation for the residents and industrial redevelopment on a planned bases. Large sites may be made available and necessary changes in street design made to meet industrial needs.

Blighted Areas. Likewise in the case of residential areas now blighted and subject to redevelopment, such as the Western Addition, the zoning district maps indicate a use pattern quite at variance with that of the Land Use Plan. The general principle followed in districting the redevelopment areas was to place the area in the most restrictive zoning classification possible with the existing use pattern. Areas where redevelopment is most imminent were placed in the lowest density residential district possible without creating numerous non-conforming uses that would cause undue difficulty in administration. In other blighted areas, where redevelopment was not considered as imminent, the present use pattern was adhered to quite closely. The public has a large stake in these blighted areas and every reasonable measure should be employed to make the redevelopment costs as low as possible. In general, new unplanned development should be discouraged in these areas.

Conservation Areas. In a number of instances existing low density residential development is found to be of high quality, where the long range possibilities suggest more intensive residential use because of the character of the site or location. In these cases single family residential will be indicated on the zoning district map while the Land Use Plan shows the future apartment development. Consequently, necessary protection is offered the existing high quality development until the time the area is ready for higher density uses.

In some vacant areas, such as those adjacent to Sutro Forst, Glen Park Canyon, or John McLaren Park, general locations for neighborhood shopping centers have been indicated in the Land Use Plan but are not shown on the zoning district maps. In such cases as these, at the time a new development plan is made, rezoning would take place to provide for the required amount of neighborhood shopping in accordance with expected population.

AREAS OF PROPOSED ZONING DISTRICTS IN ACRES

	R-1-D	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-4	R-5	C-1	C-2	C-3	C-4	C-5	C-M	M-1	M-2
TOTAL	2710	5740	3030	1620	200	140	230	150	500	190	280	260	1600	1560
Existing and Proposes Public Uses	850	940	370	300	10	10	10	0	10	20	20	0	90	0
Net Private Area	1860	4800	2710	1320	190	130	270	150	490	170	260	260	1510	1560
Tidelands	270	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	160	450
Net Private Land Area Less Tidelands	1590	4800	2710	1320	190	130	270	150	490	170	260	260	1350	1110

POPULATION LIMITS UNDER ZONING ENVELOPE

Analysis of the areas proposed to be included in the residential districts in relation to population density that could be attained in such districts, reveals that a total of in excess of 925,000 persons could be accommodated in San Francisco. The following table indicates the distribution of this population by residential districts:

	R-1-D	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-4	R-5
Population	22,800	253,700	243,000	144,800	31,000	27,100

In addition to the above population that could be accommodated in the residential districts it is estimated that approximately 80,000 could be accommodated in the C-1, C-2, and C-3 districts. An additional 90,000 to 125,000 would continue to live outside the residential communities - in the downtown area, military reservation and ships at sea.

The population figures here are not in any sense an estimate of what the population of San Francisco will be in the future; nor are they to be considered as an optimum population for the city. They are simply a measure of space available under the proposed zoning plan.

PROPOSED COMMERCIAL ZONING AND EXISTING USE BY COMMUNITY AREAS

SEPTEMBER 1949

RATIOS TO EXISTING AND FUTURE POPULATION

	COMMERCIAL PROPERTY IN COMMUNITIES					POPULATION OF COMMUNITY AREAS		ACRES PER 1000 PERSONS		
	PROPOSED ZONING DISTRICTS					ESTIMATED 1947	WITH ALL LAND USED (2)	EXISTING	PROPOSED	
	C-1	C-2	C-3	TOTAL C					AT 1947 POP.	AT POP. AS IN (g)
	a	b	c	d		f	g	h	i	
1	10.60	21.11	22.00	53.71	44.22	43,175	45,035	1.02	1.24	1.2
2	13.40	5.20	42.22	60.82	38.97	37,900	39,050	1.02	1.6	1.56
3	7.90	6.90	27.80	42.60	33.03	36,725	37,275	.09	1.16	1.14
4	53.39	15.70	44.02	128.49	83.15	78,650	79,990	1.06	1.44	1.42
5	18.71	19.30	72.02	113.33	100.52	90,800	93,490	1.02	1.2	1.18
6	19.90		24.84	55.84	30.30	47,000	56,420	.65	.95	.8
7	12.51	11.90	98.68	127.79	99.32	73,975	77,815	1.34	1.66	1.58
8	10.16		37.16	47.32	35.70	51,200	55,860	.7	.93	.85
9	22.50	6.00	25.61	54.11	29.85	51,200	59,000	.58	1.05	.92
10	13.58	5.50	41.34	60.42	35.08	37,350	42,040	.94	1.66	1.5
11	39.05	41.30	14.70	95.05	32.49	52,150	74,740	.62	1.82	1.27
12	52.11	9.60	27.61	89.32	55.52	73,050	79,810	.76	1.22	1.12
TOTAL	273.81	142.51	478.00	894.32	618.15	673,175(3)	740,575(3)	.93	1.32	1.2

(1) Total existing commercial not including open air uses.

(2) Population based on estimated 1947 population plus holding capacity of potential dwelling units on present vacant residential lots.

(3) Does not include military population, ships at sea, or population in production-service areas, total of which exceeds 125,000.

PROPOSED COMMERCIAL ZONING IN COMMUNITY AREAS

The following table gives the acreage in the several community areas proposed to be included in commercial districts for community and neighborhood shopping. Totals are compared with existing commercial use in the community areas. Comparison is also made of the ratio of the area of proposed zoning districts to estimated populations. It must be emphasized that the future population estimate is based entirely on the additional population that could be accommodated by building on land at present vacant. Examination of the table will reveal that the proposed commercial zoning is in scale with existing commercial use as well as providing for reasonable expansion that may be needed in the near future.

V. QUANTITATIVE COMPARISONS - ZONING, LAND USE, AND POPULATION

COMPARISON OF LAND USE FOR INDUSTRY IN 1919, 1937, and 1947-48,
WITH LAND ZONED FOR INDUSTRY NOW AND PROPOSED,

SAN FRANCISCO

	USE			ZONED	
	1919	1937	1947-48	1949	Proposed
Grand Total, Industry	1,027	1,524	2 061	2,495	2,457
Industry Excluding: Railroads and Government-Owned Industrial Establishments	689	1,070	1,295	1,629	1,590 ^a
Grand Total, Commerce	--	1,123	1,277	1,603	1,587 ^b

^aNot including 256 acres in C-M

^bIncluding 256 acres in C-M

INDUSTRIAL

The zoning proposals include within the industrial districts a land area of 395 acres not used for industry, railroad or government. About 280 acres of this is vacant land, practically all the rest is in residential use. It also includes 611 acres of tideland.

The 395 acres of land available for industrial use within the zoning framework provides for growth, at the rate obtaining 1919 to 1948 (21 acres a year) for 20 years of private industrial development, not including tideland fill or any change in Federal holdings.

The zoning proposals provide for about the same extent of land area in industrial districts as the present ordinance; creation of a transitional C-M district of 610 acres makes comparison difficult, but even if this be entirely excluded the proposed zoning provides for 97% as much land area as provided for in the present ordinance.

COMMERCIAL

The zoning proposals include within the commercial districts a land area of 310 acres not used for commerce of which a large proportion is vacant.

The growth at the rate obtaining during the last 10 years (15 acres a year) could continue for 15 years within the zoning envelope.

The commercial district provides for about the same extent of commercial land area as in the present ordinance; a reduction of 16 acres, or 1% is proposed from the 1603 acres of commercial districts in the present ordinance.